IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW) NO. 11 OF 2007
IN
SECOND APPEAL NO. 118 OF 2006

SHRI SURYAKANT VASSU GURAV,
SATTARI GOA. ... Applicant

Versus

SHRI DATTARAM NARAYAN MADWAL ALIAS
VELUSKAR, SATTARI. ... Respondent

Mr. D. P. Bhise, for the Applicant.

Coram:- S.A.BOBDE, J.

Date:- 26th April, 2007

P.C.:

Heard.

There is no merit in the application for review. The applicant contends that he could not have been treated as a trespasser, in view of the fact that he was a tenant. This issue was raised in the pleadings, but obviously has not been accepted. The learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the applicant omitted to file Form I and XIV which would show that the applicant was a tenant and therefore could not have been treated as a trespasser. This does not constitute a mistake or error in the Judgment, which requires review.

The review application is rejected.

S.A.BOBDE, J.

sl.